



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,528	01/23/2004	Scott Joseph Colbeck	SJO920030100US1	9208
45216	7590	02/15/2008		
Kunzler & McKenzie 8 EAST BROADWAY SUITE 600 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			EXAMINER	
			FEARER, MARK D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2143	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/763,528	Applicant(s) COLBECK ET AL.	
	Examiner MARK D. FEARER	Art Unit 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-19, 21-26 and 28-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-19, 21-26, and 28-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- Applicant's Amendment filed 23 November 2007 is acknowledged.
- Claims 1, 11, 16 and 24 have been amended.
- Claims 7, 20 and 27 are cancelled.
- Claims 1-6, 8-19, 21-26 and 28-30 are pending in the present application.
- This action is made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff (US 6886035 B2) in view of Flanagan et al. (US 6243737 B1) and in further view of Bowman-Amuah (US 6571282 B1).

Consider claim 1. Wolff discloses an apparatus for managing data in a grid computing environment wherein a replication management module is configured to conduct data replication operations including directory-based replication operations ((“CONFIGURATION DATABASE REPLICATOR MODULE 148: this module is responsible for replicating the copy of required records of the configuration database 120 (see FIGS. 5A-D) stored in node memory to other nodes as a result of the server configuration driver 156 calling it. It is called when a node first appears on the network, during a fail-over after a node failure, or when a node fails back. It guarantees every online node has an identical copy of the server configuration database.”) column 10 lines 11-19 (“In process 1704, a comparison is conducted between the time stamps for the last volume change, i.e. field 1382, and the last time the client conducted a dismount and mount in order to get a fresh copy of the file directory, i.e. field 1386. In decision process 1706, a determination is made as to whether the clients cached directory copy is stale. In the event this determination is in the negative, the client contains the most recent copy of the file directory resident on the volume.”) column 69 lines 47-55) and a screen driver module for presenting a GUI ((“SCREEN DRIVER 170: This module is responsible for presenting a GUI of the OS and any application executing on the node that typically require human consumption of the visual

information.”) column 11 lines 64-67). However, Wolff fails to disclose of a GUI being generated in response to a function. Flanagan et al. discloses a GUI module that generates one or more windows (“FIG. 6 is a flow diagram illustrating an overview of the logic implemented by the configuration module 44 of the present invention that allows the administrator of the transaction server 12 to configure client to host transaction mappings. FIGS. 20A-G illustrate the windows generated by the GUI module 42 of the direct transaction mapping program 38 which are used by the administrator to configure the client to host transaction mappings in accordance with the configuration module 44. As one of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate, a text based user interface or other interface may also be used without departing from the scope of the present invention.”) column 8 lines 12-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a GUI module that generates one or more windows as taught by Flanagan et al. with an apparatus for managing data in a grid computing environment wherein a replication management module is configured to conduct data replication operations including directory-based replication operations and a screen driver module for presenting a GUI as taught by Wolff for the purpose of workflow management. However, Wolff, as modified by Flanagan et al., fails to disclose an apparatus comprising examining user credentials, generating a web based graphical user interface, or replication based on user input. Bowman-Amuah discloses block-based communication in a communication services patterns environment comprising examining user credentials (column 47 lines 60-67 and column 48 lines 1-10), generating a web based graphical user interface

(column 28 lines 58-67 and column 29 lines 1-27), and replication based on user input (column 49 lines 59-67 and column 29 lines 1-27).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate block-based communication in a communication services patterns environment comprising examining user credentials, generating a web based graphical user interface, and replication based on user input as taught by Bowman-Amuah with a GUI module that generates one or more windows and an apparatus for managing data in a grid computing environment wherein a replication management module is configured to conduct data replication operations including directory-based replication operations and a screen driver module for presenting a GUI as taught by Wolff, as modified by Flanagan et al., for the purpose of selective replication for content management.

Consider claims 8-10. Wolff, as modified by Flanagan et al. and Bowman-Amuah, further discloses a client-server system comprising data replication further comprising volume tables constructed from a previous search ((“Total_tables 14xx’ This value indicates the total number of Volume tables that have been configured and found at a previous search. This is the number that will automatically be expected to be found upon net startup.”) Wolff, column 62 lines 12-16), a function for changing file attributes ((“Control is then passed to process 1370 where commands to get attributes of a file are managed by the metadata server. Control is then passed to process 1372 where commands to set the attributes of a file are managed by the metadata server.”) Wolff, column 53 lines 13-17), and a publishing function of the replicated data ((“These results

are replicated to each servers copy of the dynamic RAM resident configuration database 120A2-B2, the results are published and received by processes 104PC on server 104C, and the lock 120D1 is removed.”) Wolff, column 8 lines 25-29).

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff (US 6886035 B2) as modified by Flanagan et al. (US 6243737 B1) in view of Bowman-Amuah (US 6571282 B1) and in further view of Midgley et al. (US 20030074378 A1).

Consider claims 2-4. Wolff, as modified by Flanagan et al. and Bowman-Amuah, discloses a manageable collaborative computing system. However, Wolff, as modified by Flanagan et al. and Bowman-Amuah, fails to disclose of a collaborative computing system further comprising a replica location service, at least one replica location index, and at least one local replica catalog. Midgley et al. discloses a replicating system comprising a catalog process that is capable of recording metadata representing the locations of the versions of the target files on the storage medium that creates an index for accessing the versions of a target file (“In a further aspect, the systems and methods described herein can include backup systems that include a long term storage system for recording target data files to a storage medium in response to the operation of the dynamic replication process, thereby storing versions of the target file on the storage medium. Additionally, in an optional environment the systems may include a catalog process that can record metadata that is representative of the locations of the versions of the target files on the storage medium to thereby create an index for accessing these versions of the target file. The catalog process may include a mechanism for storing security metadata that is associated with the different versions of

the target data files and that is representative of the users access rights for the versions of the target data file.”) paragraph 0021).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a replicating system comprising a catalog process that is capable of recording metadata representing the locations of the versions of the target files on the storage medium that creates an index for accessing the versions of a target file as taught by Midgley et al. with a manageable collaborative computing system as taught by Wolff, as modified by Flanagan et al. and Bowman-Amuah, for the purpose of web-based grid computing comprising remote sites.

Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff (US 6886035 B2) as modified by Flanagan et al. (US 6243737 B1) in view of Bowman-Amuah (US 6571282 B1) and in further view of Zhang et al. (US 20050120353 A1).

Consider claims 5-6. Wolff, as modified by Flanagan et al. and Bowman-Amuah, discloses a manageable collaborative computing system. However, Wolff, as modified by Flanagan et al. and Bowman-Amuah, fails to disclose a grid system comprising a file transfer service. Zhang et al. discloses a data replication system consisting of ftp, grid ftp, http, rft, and file transfer (“The action manager 12, which is the engine of the framework, receives collaborative messages (or CxP) messages from a design partner side, which can be a Web portal. In each message, it contains meta data or annotations describing the documents to be exchanged, such as the file name, size, author, application to use to open the design file, etc. In addition, annotations can also specify integration activities to be performed, representing new application to be integrated,

such as FTP, reliable file transfer (RFT) or an invocation to a legacy adaptor. Also, an alternative data source to the Action Manager, in addition to collaborative messages, is an RDF string.”) paragraph 0024 (“The logical structure of ActivityChain ontology is shown in FIG. 3. The top-level entity is Class Activity. It has a DataTypeProperty securityHandler and an ObjectProperty actname. The ObjectProperty actname has a range which is Class Actname. And Actname is a collection which enumerates GridFTP,FTP, HTTP, Inv-service, Inv-Appl and Search-Annt.”) paragraph 0045).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a data replication system consisting of ftp, grid ftp, http, rft, and file transfer as taught by Zhang et al. with a manageable collaborative computing system as taught by Wolff, as modified by Flanagan et al. and Bowman-Amuah, for the purpose of reliable file transfer in a collaborative environment.

Claims 11-13, 16-18, and 24 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Midgley et al. (US 20030074378 A1) in view of Tripp (US 20050015466 A1).

Consider claims 11, 16 and 24. Midgley et al. discloses a method for managing data in a grid computing environment, the method comprising: providing a graphical user interface configured to facilitate invocation of data replication operations by a user including directory-based replication operations ((“The replicated data structure 54 also provides directories, subdirectories and data records.”) paragraph 0040); invoking a replica location service associated with a grid ((“The database can include pointers to the location of the different versions of the target files on the tape, thereby providing

Art Unit: 2152

more rapid access to the location on the tape that includes the information a user may want to restore.”) paragraph 0041); and conducting the data replication operations in response to selections on the graphical user interface by the user ((“This system can provide a user interface that will allow the user to select a network consumption limit that is representative of the users selected limit for the amount of network bandwidth to be allocated to the backup replication process and the agent process.”) paragraph 0019). However, Midgley et al. fails to disclose a method comprising a dynamic web based graphical user interface, a search interface for discovering replicated data including directory based replicated data, a replica location service configured to aggregate information about local replica catalogs and map logical file names to physical file names, or conduct local or remote data replication and mapping in response to user selections. Tripp discloses a method of peer-to-peer automated anonymous asynchronous file sharing comprising a dynamic web based graphical user interface (paragraph 0081), a search interface for discovering replicated data including directory based replicated data (paragraphs 0029-0030), a replica location service configured to aggregate information about local replica catalogs and map logical file names to physical file names (paragraphs 0069 and 0083), and conduct local or remote data replication and mapping in response to user selections (paragraph 0084).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a method of peer-to-peer automated anonymous asynchronous file sharing comprising a dynamic web based graphical user interface, a search interface for discovering replicated data including directory based

Art Unit: 2152

replicated data, a replica location service configured to aggregate information about local replica catalogs and map logical file names to physical file names, and conduct local or remote data replication and mapping in response to user selections as taught by Tripp with a method for managing data in a grid computing environment, the method comprising: providing a graphical user interface configured to facilitate invocation of data replication operations by a user including directory-based replication operations; invoking a replica location service associated with a grid; and conducting the data replication operations in response to selections on the graphical user interface by the user as taught by Midgley et al. for the purpose of data retrieval services.

Consider claims 12 and 17. Midgley et al., as modified by Tripp, further discloses a method comprising accessing at least one replica location index (“Additionally, in an optional environment the systems may include a catalog process that can record metadata that is representative of the locations of the versions of the target files on the storage medium to thereby create an index for accessing these versions of the target file.”) Midgley et al., paragraph 0021).

Consider claims 13 and 18. Midgley et al., as modified by Tripp, further discloses a method comprising accessing at least one local replica catalog (“The catalog process may include a mechanism for storing security metadata that is associated with the different versions of the target data files and that is representative of the users access rights for the versions of the target data file.”) Midgley et al., paragraph 0021).

Claims 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Midgley et al. (US 20030074378 A1) in view of Tripp (US 20050015466 A1) and in further view of Zhang et al. (US 20050120353 A1).

Consider claims 14 and 19. Midgley et al., as modified by Tripp, discloses a system for backing up data files comprising data replication. However, Midgley et al., as modified by Tripp, fails to disclose a system comprising a file transfer service. Zhang et al. discloses a system comprising the file transfer protocols FTP and RFT (“The action manager 12, which is the engine of the framework, receives collaborative messages (or CxP) messages from a design partner side, which can be a Web portal. In each message, it contains meta data or annotations describing the documents to be exchanged, such as the file name, size, author, application to use to open the design file, etc. In addition, annotations can also specify integration activities to be performed, representing new application to be integrated, such as FTP, reliable file transfer (RFT) or an invocation to an legacy adaptor. Also, an alternative data source to the Action Manager, in addition to collaborative messages, is an RDF string.”) paragraph 0024).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a system comprising the file transfer protocols FTP and RFT as taught by Zhang et al. with a system comprising data replication as taught by Midgley et al., as modified by Tripp, for the purpose of file transfer in a grid environment.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Midgley et al. (US 20030074378 A1) in view of Tripp (US 20050015466 A1) and in further view of Flanagan et al. (US 6243737 B1).

Consider claim 15. Midgley et al., as modified by Tripp, discloses a system for backing up data files comprising data replication. However, Midgley et al., as modified by Tripp, fails to disclose a system wherein a graphical user interface comprises a web page. Flanagan et al. discloses an interactive web-based solution (“There have been various proposed methods for providing information residing on a host system to customers through the Internet, in particular, using the Web. A typical solution involves adding new software code on the host system that interfaces with Web-based users.”) column 1 lines 29-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate an interactive web-based solution as taught by Flanagan et al. with a system comprising data replication as taught by Midgley et al., as modified by Tripp, for the purpose of inter-operability in a collaborative environment.

Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Midgley et al. (US 20030074378 A1) in view of Tripp (US 20050015466 A1) and in further view of Wolff (US 6886035 B2).

Consider claims 21-23. Midgley et al., as modified by Tripp, discloses a system for backing up data files comprising data replication. However, Midgley et al., as

Art Unit: 2152

modified by Tripp, fails to disclose a data replication system comprising replications operations that are conducted on catalog search results, a method for changing file attributes, or a publishing function. Wolff discloses a client-server system comprising data replication further comprising volume tables constructed from a previous search ((“Total_tables 14xx’ This value indicates the total number of Volume tables that have been configured and found at a previous search. This is the number that will automatically be expected to be found upon net startup.”) column 62 lines 12-16), a function for changing file attributes ((“Control is then passed to process 1370 where commands to get attributes of a file are managed by the metadata server. Control is then passed to process 1372 where commands to set the attributes of a file are managed by the metadata server.”) column 53 lines 13-17), and a publishing function of the replicated data ((“These results are replicated to each servers copy of the dynamic RAM resident configuration database 120A2-B2, the results are published and received by processes 104PC on server 104C, and the lock 120D1 is removed.”) column 8 lines 25-29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a data replication system comprising replications operations that are conducted on catalog search results, a method for changing file attributes, and a publishing function as taught by Wolff with a data replication system as taught by Midgley et al., as modified by Tripp, for the purpose of metadata catalog services in a grid computing environment.

Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Midgley et al. (US 20030074378 A1) in view of James (US 6910038 B1).

Consider claims 25-26. Midgley et al. discloses a replication server configured to generate at least one graphical user interface and conduct data replication operations including directory-based replication operations in response to user selections on the graphical user interface ((“This system can provide a user interface that will allow the user to select a network consumption limit that is representative of the users selected limit for the amount of network bandwidth to be allocated to the backup replication process and the agent process.”) paragraph 0019 (“The replicated data structure 54 also provides directories, subdirectories and data records.”) paragraph 0040).

However, Midgley et al. fails to disclose a replication server comprising a replica location index. James discloses a method for host processing comprising a computing node having a replica location index, the replica location index configured to map logical names to a local replica catalog ((“One embodiment of a record data structure is illustrated in FIG. 2B. Typical data fields include, as illustrated, the file parent of the data file. This information is used to map the file path to the data file in its destination location in order to locate the file on the destination CD. The volume label index is additional location identification information naming the source volume of the data file. The file size identifies the exact size of the file in bytes (or other suitable units of measure) to be used in calculating and identifying the destination location of the data and in making the determination which files will be sent to system cache memory during the writing operation. Files that are sent to system cache memory are further

Art Unit: 2152

identified by the location in the system cache memory which holds the data file as described in greater detail below, and the file size is used to calculate that location. The logical block number identifies the destination location by the logical block where the data file will be written. The file time is the most recent modification time of the data file. This provides both the time and the date of the file, and can be used, for example, in both cataloging as well as differentiating between two identically named files. The file source path is the complete path to the data file in order to locate and read the file during the recording operation, and the file attributes include such information as whether the file is a system file, a read-only file, if it is a hidden file, and whether it is an archive file.”) column 5 lines 3-27).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a method for host processing comprising a computing node having a replica location index, the replica location index configured to map logical names to a local replica catalog as taught by James with a replication server configured to generate at least one graphical user interface and conduct data replication operations including directory-based replication operations in response to user selections on the graphical user interface as taught by Midgley et al. for the purpose of grid hosting.

Consider claim 29. Midgley et al., as modified by James, discloses a system wherein a replication server is configured to invoke a replica location service associated with a grid (“The database can include pointers to the location of the different versions

of the target files on the tape, thereby providing more rapid access to the location on the tape that includes the information a user may want to restore.”) paragraph 0041).

Consider claim 30. Midgley et al., as modified by James, discloses a system wherein a replication server is configured to access at least one replica location index (“Additionally, in an optional environment the systems may include a catalog process that can record metadata that is representative of the locations of the versions of the target files on the storage medium to thereby create an index for accessing these versions of the target file.”) paragraph 0021).

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Midgley et al. (US 20030074378 A1) in view of James (US 6910038 B1) and in further view of Wolff (US 6886035 B2).

Consider claim 28. Midgley et al., as modified by James, discloses a system for backing up data files comprising host processing methods. However, Midgley et al., as modified by James, fails to disclose a system comprising a replication server configured to conduct publishing operations, replication operations on search results, and change attributes associated with a file. Wolff discloses a system wherein a replication server is configured to conduct publishing operations (“These results are replicated to each servers copy of the dynamic RAM resident configuration database 120A2-B2, the results are published and received by processes 104PC on server 104C, and the lock 120D1 is removed.”) column 8 lines 25-29), conduct replication operations on search results (“Total_tables 14xx’ This value indicates the total number of Volume tables that have been configured and found at a previous search. This is the number that will

automatically be expected to be found upon net startup.”) column 62 lines 12-16), and change attributes associated with a file (“Control is then passed to process 1370 where commands to get attributes of a file are managed by the metadata server. Control is then passed to process 1372 where commands to set the attributes of a file are managed by the metadata server.”) column 53 lines 13-17).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a system wherein a replication server is configured to conduct publishing operations, conduct replication operations on search results, and change attributes associated with a file as taught by Wolff with a system for backing up data files comprising host processing methods as taught by Midgley et al., as modified by James, for the purpose of a grid data mirroring package.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 23 November 2007 with respect to claims 1, 7-13, 16-18, and 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2152

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any response to this Office Action should be faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Mark Fearer whose telephone number is (571) 270-1770. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for

Art Unit: 2152

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 571-272-4100.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Mark Fearer
M.D.F./mdf
February 11, 2008

/Kenny S Lin/
Kenny S Lin
Primary Examiner